

# UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### **Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR			ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	
037033,004	00/10/98	ν <u>ι 1005</u>		U VA	E0829P0012	
QM51/0427  DRESSLER GOLDSMITH SHORE & MILNAMOW  TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA			乛	DEAL, D	AMINER	
SUITE 4700 180 NORTH STE	TOOM ALIEN	, p		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CHICAGO IL 60		IE.		3752	5	
				DATE MAILED: ()	4/27/99	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks** 



Office Action Summary

## Application No. 09/099,684

Applicant(s)

De Pous et al.

Examiner

**David Deal** 

Group Art Unit 3752



X Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 29, 1998	·				
☐ This action is FINAL.					
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935					
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure tapplication to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensic 37 CFR 1.136(a).	to respond within the period for response will cause the				
Disposition of Claims					
	is/are pending in the application.				
Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.				
Claim(s)	is/are allowed.				
	ŕ				
Claim(s)	is/are objected to.				
☐ Claims are subject to restriction or election requirement					
Application Papers  X See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing	g Review, PTO-948.				
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are object	ed to by the Examiner.				
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is Epproved Edisapproved.				
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
$\hfill\Box$ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority to	under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).				
☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of	the priority documents have been				
received.	·				
received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Num	·				
received in this national stage application from the					
*Certified copies not received:					
	y diladi. 00 010101 y 110(0).				
Attachment(s)  X Notice of References Cited, PTO-892					
	o(s). 2				
☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413	·····				
X Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-94	8				
☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152					
SEE OFFICE ACTION ON T	HE FOLLOWING PAGES				

Application/Control Number: 09/099,684

Art Unit:

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Brocklin. Van Brocklin discloses an assembly for securing and sealing a dispenser to a flanged container having a top portion of an annular fixing ring 26 sized to accept the dispenser 80 and a bottom portion with inwardly extending snap-fastening projections 46. The dispenser is positioned on a receptacle 10 having an opening 14 and a flange 16. The assembly is secured to the container by means of an annular hoop 24. The method of assembling this device according to the applicant's claim is inherent if not obvious. First it would be obvious to combine the dispenser, the annular fixing ring and the annular hoop. Second it would be obvious to fasten this combination on the top of the container and to do so by pushing down until the snap fastening projections 46 are engaged with the container flange. Finally it would be obvious to push the annular hoop down over the fixing ring as shown in figures 7 and 8 to deform the fixing ring "until at least part of the hoop is disposed adjacent said snap-fastening projection".

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 09/099,684

Art Unit:

3.

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cater.

Cater discloses a device for securing a dispenser to a glass container having a dispenser 100, an annular fixing ring 106, an annular hoop 116 having an inwardly extending snapfastening projection 50 (figures 8 and 9) which is adapted to engage receptacle flange 102. The method of assembling this device according to the applicant's claim is inherent if not obvious. First it would be obvious to combine the dispenser, the annular fixing ring and the annular hoop. Second it would be obvious to fasten this combination on the top of the container and to do so by pushing down until the snap fastening projections 50 are engaged with the container flange. Finally it would be obvious to push the annular hoop down over the fixing ring as shown in figures 6,7,8 and 9 to deform the fixing ring "until at least part of the hoop is disposed adjacent said snapfastening projection".

#### Conclusion

- 4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Patents to Meshberg and Mascitelli disclose similar devices to applicant's invention.
- 5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Deal whose telephone number is (703) 308-2782.

D.D. Do 4/21/99
April 21, 1999

ANDRES KASHNIKOW
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXCENTER
ART UNIT 314-3 7 72